UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,400	12/22/2000	Roland Radtke	60001.0002US01	8785

27488 7590 08/23/2006	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)	PILLAI, NAMITHA	
P.O. BOX 2903	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903	2173	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/747,400	RADTKE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Namitha Pillai	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 May 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7 and 9-15* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 3-7 and 9-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   The Examiner acknowledges Applicant's submission on 5/15/06 including

amendments to claims 1, 6, 7 and 12. All pending claims have been rejected for being

obvious over prior arts disclosed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 4, 899, 276 (Stadler) and further in view of U. S.

Patent No. 4,646,250 (Childress) and U. S. Patent No. 5,736,984 (Jellinek et al).

        Referring to claims 1 and 7, Stadler discloses providing a plurality of data fields

amongst these fields, there being a first data field and a second data field, wherein the

user would be in a first data field and the next field the user would move to would be the

second data field (column 1, lines 21-24 and column 3, line 17). Stadler discloses being

in a first data field, thereby bringing focus to that first field, that being the current data

field that the user is entering data onto and in response to focusing on the first field,

displaying a first static information tip proximate to the first data field (column 2, lines

33-37). Stadler then further discusses moving onto the next field, thereby focusing on

the second data field, wherein once the user has finished inputting data into the first

field, and has pressed "ENTER", the focus is brought to the second data field and the

first static information tip is hidden from view (column 3, lines 17-20 and lines 61-65).

Stadler also discloses that in addition to the user input of "ENTER", focus is brought to

the second data field automatically once the user has finished inputting into the first

input field (column 3, lines 18-20). Stadler also discloses repeating the same steps as

was the case for the first field once the user has moved onto the second data field,

wherein this suggests, as was the case for the first data field, bringing focus to that

second field, that being the current data field that the user is entering data onto and in

response to focusing on the second and current field, displaying static information tip

proximate to the second data field, wherein the tip would be associated with the data in

the second data field (column 3, lines 17-18 and column 2, lines 33-37). Stadler

discloses that the first static tip does not interrupt data input into the first data field

(column 3, lines 55-58) and whereby the first information tip remains displayed until the

step of focusing on the second data field, the step being pressing "ENTER", which

would move the cursor and focus from the first data field to the subsequent second data

field (column 3, lines 61-65). Stadler does disclose entering data in the first data field

(column 3, line 17). Stadler does not disclose means for determining or handling errors

within these fields, as recited in the claims. Childress discloses determining that the

data entered into the first field is erroneous and having a means to place error markers

adjacent to the first data field, where the errors are found, thereby bringing focus to the

first data (column 2, lines 13-20 and lines 37-39). Childress by determining an error and

placing markers near the field in which the errors are found, would then bring refocus to

the field in which the error is found, with the displaying of such an error marker. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention to learn from Childress to implement a means for detecting and bringing refocus to the first data field that has the erroneous input. Stadler has means for allowing users to input data but as is common with data entry, erroneous data inputs are inevitable. There is no means in Stadler's disclosure for detecting these errors, which would inevitable in any data entry system. Hence, one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention, would have been motivated to learn from Childress to implement error detection and highlighting means for bring refocus to the field with an error input.

Stadler and Childress do not provide means for displaying a third static information tip proximate to the first data field, as recited in the claims. Jellinek discloses providing tips proximate to the data field, where in response to focusing on the input field and inputting data, the tip providing means provides a information tip for correcting the errors detected, with the third static information tip not interrupting the corrective data input into the data field (Figure 7 and column 7, lines 36-40). Once the error has been determined by the first input by the user, a refocusing step occurs, where in response to refocus brought to the field, the third tip information is displayed. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Jellinek to implement a means for providing a third static tip information for the data field wherein an error was detected. Stadler and Childress do have the means for detecting errors but provides no tip information to correct this error, thereby causing confusion for users who may not know how to fix the errors. As clearly stated in

Jellinek, the disclosure states how this invention clearly teaches means for displaying a

message to fix the error without being intrusive and wherein the users would simply

follow this third static tip to correct the errors. Hence, one skilled in the art, at the time

of the invention, would have been motivated to learn from Jellinek to implement a

means for providing a static third information tip which would not be obtrusive to the

data field.

Referring to claims 3 and 9, Stadler, Childress and Jellinek discloses moving to a

second data field and repeating the same process for manipulating this data field

(Stadler, column 3, lines 17-18), wherein these steps include the steps recited in claim

2, in reference to the detection and the displaying of error tip information for the second

data field.

Referring to claims 4, 5, 10 and 11, Stadler, Childress and Jellinek disclose

displaying an error marker proximate to the first and second data fields, and included in

all data fields with erroneous data fields (Childress, column 2, lines 37-40).

Referring to claims 6 and 12, Stadler discloses focusing all a first data field, and

in response to focusing on the first data field, wherein a first static information tip

proximate to the first data field (column 2, lines 39-41). Stadler also discloses entering

data in the first data field while continuing to display the first static information tip

(column 3, lines 61-64). Stadler also discloses moving onto another data field from the

first data field, that wherein once the "ENTER" has pressed to move onto the next field,

the first static information tip would be hidden from view (column 3, lines 63-65).

Stadler also discloses that in addition to the user input of "ENTER", focus is brought to

the second data field automatically once the user has finished inputting into the first

input field (column 3, lines 18-20). Stadler does not disclose means for detecting or

handling errors within these fields, as recited in the claims. Childress discloses

determining that the data entered into the first field is erroneous and having a means to

place error markers adjacent to the first data field, where the errors are found, thereby

bringing focus to the first data (column 2, lines 13-20 and lines 37-39). It would have

been obvious for one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention to learn from

Childress to implement a means for detecting and bringing focus to the first data field

that as the erroneous input. Stadler has means for allowing users to input data but as is

common with data entry, erroneous data inputs are inevitable. There is no means in

Stadler's disclosure for detecting these errors, which would inevitable in any data entry

system. Hence, one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention, would have been

motivated to learn from Childress to implement error detection and highlighting means.

Stadler and Childress do not provide means for displaying a second static

information tip proximate to the first data field, as recited in the claims. Jellinek

discloses providing tips proximate to the data field, where in response to focusing on the

input field and inputting data, the tip providing means provides a information tip for

correcting the errors detected, with the second static information tip not interrupting the

corrective data input into the data field (Figure 7 and column 7, lines 36-40). Once the

error has been determined by the first input by the user, a refocusing step occurs,

where in response to refocus brought to the field, the third tip information is displayed.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn

from Jellinek to implement a means for providing second static tip information for the data field wherein an error was detected. Stadler and Childress do have the means for detecting errors but provides no tip information to correct this error, thereby causing confusion for users who may not know how to fix the errors. As clearly stated in Jellinek, the disclosure states how this invention clearly teaches means for displaying a message to fix the error without being intrusive and wherein the users would simply follow this second static tip to correct the errors. Hence, one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention, would have been motivated to learn from Jellinek to implement a means for providing a static third information tip which would not be obtrusive to the data field.

Referring to claims 13-15, Stadler, Childress and Jellinek disclose that focusing on the first data field comprises placing a cursor in the first data field (Stadler, column 1, lines 39-43).

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 5/15/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments disclose that Stadler does not disclose hiding the information tip simultaneously with focusing on the second data field. The simultaneous process is not clearly taught in the present claims. Furthermore, it would have been obvious that a tip for a first field would disappear just as focus is brought to another field, so that tip information for that specific field can be displayed. Stadler suggests a user action such

as "ENTER" to bring focus to another field but Stadler previously also mentions that focus can be brought to a second input field automatically (column 3, lines 18-20).

Conclusion

4.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Responses to this action should be submitted as per the options cited below: The United States Patent and Trademark Office requires most patent related correspondence to be: a) faxed to the Central Fax number (571-273-8300) b) hand carried or delivered to the Customer Service Window (located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), c) mailed to the mailing address set forth in 37 CFR 1.1 (e.g., P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450), or d) transmitted to the Office using the Office's Electronic Filing System.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Namitha Pillai whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4054. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Namitha Pillai
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2173
August 21, 2006

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173